REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated July 15, 2005, claims 2, 12, and 22 have been cancelled, and claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-11, 13-21, and 23-30 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

II. Prior Art Rejections

On page (3) of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 9, 11-16, 19, 21-26, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Janssen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,512,529 (Janssen). On page (6) of the Office Action, claims 7, 17, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janssen and Microsoft® Word 2000 (Microsoft®) presented in previous Office Action. On page (7) of the Office Action, claims 8, 10, 18, 20, 28, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janssen and Wandersleben et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,853,390 (Wandersleben).

Specifically, the independent claims were rejected as follows:

> Specifically regarding claims 1, 11, and 21, Janssen teaches: displaying a window of a currently active application on a display device; determining a location of a cursor with respect to the window; displaying a collapsed version of the window, as an "invisible" window, when the cursor moves outside of the window without depressing a button of the window, wherein the collapsed version of the window consumes a smaller area of the display device than the complete window; and displaying the complete window when the cursor moves within the collapsed version of the window, without depressing a button of the window (for example, see column 2, line 33 – column 2, line 20; column 4, line 56 – column 5, line 9). As asserted above, it is understood that such teachings may apply to dialog windows, a well known type of window in the art. Janssen further discloses that such teachings may be implemented as software, presumably stored in computer memory and executed by a computer (see column 4, lines 5-40). Such computer memory comprising software to implement the teachings of Janssen is considered an "article of manufacture," like described in claim 11. Such a computer executing the software to implement the teachings of Janssen is considered a system like that described in claim 21.

In addition, dependent claims 2, 12, and 22 were rejected as follows:

> Concerning claims 2-3, 5, 12-13, 15, 22-23, and 25, Janssen teaches that the collapsed version of the may comprise only a title bar of the window (for example, see column 2, line 59-column 3, line 4).

Applicant traverses the above rejections. Namely, Janssen, Microsoft®, and Wandersleben all fail to teach, disclose or suggest displaying a complete dialog window by moving a cursor into a

title bar that comprises a collapsed version of the full window. Further, Janssen teaches away from such claim limitations.

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21, are generally directed to collapsing a dialog window. More specifically, the independent claims provide for merely moving the cursor outside of the complete dialog window to cause the collapsed version of the dialog window to display. Further, merely moving the cursor within the collapsed version of the dialog window causes the complete dialog window to display. In addition, the amended independent claims (that merely incorporated limitations from prior dependent claims 2, 12, and 22) provide that the collapsed version of the dialog window is a title bar of the dialog window. Thus, as amended, the claims now provide that when the cursor moves out of the complete window, the title bar of the complete window is shown. Further, to display the complete dialog window again, the user moves the cursor into the title bar.

The differences between the amended claims and Janssen clearly establish patentability of the invention. Applicants first note that for Janssen to display the complete opaque window, the user merely moves the cursor anywhere into the extent of the window. In other words, rather than forcing the user to move into the title bar, the user merely moves the cursor into any part of the area where the full invisible window resides, and the full opaque window is then displayed. Such a window display is different from the present invention where the user must move the cursor into the title bar and not anywhere within the extent of the full window. Such differences are significant.

Applicants direct the attention of the Examiner to the background of Janssen and note that Janssen is directed towards applications where information in windows of the application change dynamically independent of operator intervention (see col. 1, lines 41-44). In this regard, Janssen refers to an air traffic control display where aircraft are plotted on a display according to their current position that dynamically changes without user intervention (see col. 1, lines 44-50). Janssen also relies on such an example in the detailed description of the invention (see col. 4, line 43-col. 5, line 47 and FIGS. 2-4). Janssen continues in the background and explains that the operator needs to view the background air traffic while viewing other information as well (see col. 1, lines 58-col. 2, line 5).

To cure the problems of the prior art, Janssen merely provides the ability for a window to become invisible and therefore allowing the user to see the background radar data under the invisible window. To display the contents of the informational windows (that are invisible), the user

merely moves the cursor anywhere into the area of the invisible window again. (See FIG. 3, col. 4, lines 57-col. 5, line 9).

The noted difference or problem with Janssen's invention is that the user cannot work in the background radar data screen under where the invisible window is displayed. In other words, the only use of Janssen is to allow the user to visually see the background radar data. As Janssen itself states, there is no user interaction with the window but the information dynamically changes without user interaction. Further, even if the user wanted to interact with the data, Janssen's invention would not permit it. In this regard, as soon as the user moves the cursor to a place where the invisible window exists, the full window is displayed and the user cannot work on the background radar data.

In view of the above, it can be seen that the differences between Janssen and the present claims are significant and the present invention provides significant and clear advantages over that of Janssen. Further, there is no suggestion or motivation to modify Janssen to provide the benefits of the present invention or in the manner disclosed in the present invention.

In addition to the differences between the independent claims and Janssen, the dependent claims provide further advantages. For example, dependent claim 7 is directed towards the focus of the window wherein when the collapsed version of the window is displayed, the focus reverts to another window of the application. There is not even a remote suggestion of such a teaching in Janssen. In this regard, Janssen teaches away from such a limitation. For example, since Janssen teaches to merely display the background radar information that does not have any user interaction, there would be no need to revert the focus to the background radar – there would be no reason or rationale for such a focus. Further, the user would be incapable of working in Janssen's background since the complete opaque window would be displayed as soon as the cursor moved into the area thereby returning the focus to the front informational window (see FIGS. 2-4 of Janssen).

The Office Action relies on Microsoft Word 2000 to teach the limitations of claims 7, 17, and 27. However, in view of the teaching away by Janssen, there would be no reason or rationale to combine Janssen with Microsoft Word 2000. The claims are specific in their use and limitations. Microsoft Word 2000 lacks numerous aspects of the claims and cannot be combined with Janssen. Again, Janssen teaches away from focusing on the background radar or another window.

Accordingly, there would be no use or desire to change the focus as suggested in the Office Action or in Microsoft Word 2000.

Moreover, the various elements of Applicant's claimed invention together provide operational advantages over Janssen, Microsoft®, and Wandersleben. In addition, Applicant's invention solves problems not recognized by Janssen, Microsoft®, and Wandersleben.

Thus, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 are allowable over Janssen, Microsoft®, and Wandersleben. Further, dependent claims 3-10, 13-20, and 23-30 are submitted to be allowable over Janssen, Microsoft®, and Wandersleben in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 3-10, 13-20, and 23-30 recite additional novel elements not shown by Janssen, Microsoft®, and Wandersleben.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: October 17, 2005

By: _____
Name: Jason S. Feldmar
Reg. No.: 39,187

JSF/